

EXECUTIVE SECRETARIAT

ROUTING SLIP

TO:		ACTION	INFO	DATE	INITIAL
1	DCI				
2	DDCI				
3	EXDIR				
4	D/ICS				
5	DDI				
6	DDA				
7	DDO				
8	DDS&T				
9	Chm/NIC				
10	GC				
11	IG				
12	Compt				
13	D/OLL				
14	D/PAO		X		
15	D/PERS				
16	VC/NIC				
17	ER				
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
SUSPENSE		Date			

Remarks

Executive Secretary

7 NOV 85

Date

3637 (10-81)

Executive Registry

86- 4416

Bernard Edelman

STAT

November 5, 1985

Events around the world happen so quickly, it is sometimes difficult to gather all of the facts. Acts of terror are widespread and must be resisted.

If you have not already seen them, please examine the enclosed items.

Please also accept my best wishes for your continued good health.

Bernard Edelman

Bernard Edelman



Don't Forget the Helsinki Thousands

By SARI HORWITZ
And DOUGLAS MISHKIN

The plight of Soviet Jews is often reduced to the single case of Anatoly Shcharansky. For seven years the Western press has focused its accounts of Soviet Jewry on Mr. Shcharansky, a scientist convicted in 1978 of trumped-up spying charges and sentenced to 13 years in a Siberian labor camp.

But on the 10th anniversary of the Helsinki international human-rights accord, the world should know there are hundreds more "Shcharanskys" whose names and cases have gone unreported. Largely ignored as old news, these Soviet Jews continue to be arrested, beaten, imprisoned and shipped off to labor camps for the "crime" of applying to emigrate to Israel.

We recently spent 10 days meeting with Jewish activists in Moscow and Leningrad. These "refuseniks"—Jews whose applications for exit visas have been arbitrarily refused—said that under the leadership of the new Soviet premier, Mikhail Gorbachev, their harassment has escalated. They told us of jobs being taken away, apartments being searched, phones being disconnected, mail being seized and—most disturbing—more refuseniks being arrested on trumped-up charges.

During our trip, we met with the family and friends of a 24-year-old Soviet Jew who was imprisoned in January, ostensibly for the crime of writing letters to Soviet officials appealing the denial of his visa application.

While we talked one Sunday afternoon with this prisoner's visibly shaken father, the prisoner continued to languish in a Moscow jail cell without notice of a scheduled trial date, without being told specifically why he had been arrested five months earlier, and without the assistance of a lawyer.

The unmistakable message of this and other recent cases is that a refusenik may be arrested at whim, beaten without cause and detained without explanation. In fact, the refuseniks said that this summer, for the first time since the Stalin era, Soviet authorities arrested and imprisoned a Jew based on their official confiscation of his private mail, a blatant violation of the 1975 Helsinki Accords.

Such arrests, while perhaps not surprising in light of the history of the Soviet Union's treatment of Jewish activists, are nonetheless significant because they appear to undercut the hopeful speculation by some Western observers that the new Gorbachev regime would demonstrate an increased sensitivity to human rights.

By most counts, about 10,000 Soviet Jews have been refused visas, and an additional 300,000 to 400,000 of the approximately two million Jews still in the Soviet Union have requested applications for visas.

Even while the 10th anniversary of the Helsinki agreement was approaching:

- Roald Zelichonok, a Hebrew teacher, was arrested in Leningrad and charged with defaming the Soviet state.

- Evgeny Aisenberg, a Hebrew teacher

in Kharkov, was sentenced to 2½ years in a labor camp.

- Dan Shapiro, a talented linguist, Hebrew teacher and Jewish activist, continued to serve an indeterminate pre-trial sentence in a Moscow jail.

- Yuli Edelshtein, a Jewish prisoner in a Siberian labor camp, was being battered daily by prison authorities who wanted to "beat the religion out of him," according to the U.S. State Department.

These four men are among the latest victims of what the State Department recently decried as "an official Soviet campaign against the current revival of Jewish culture in the Soviet Union."

Recent arrests of Soviet Jews remain largely unreported because, as some Western journalists explain, they have become commonplace and thus are not newsworthy. However, when the routine arrests and harassment of Soviet Jews are, in the words of our State Department, "a real obstacle to the constructive relations with the Soviet Union that the United States seeks," then even the routine is newsworthy.

By ignoring these repeated violations of human rights and international law, the press allows the Soviet Union to systematize persecution while leaving the mistaken impression with the American public that the oppression of Soviet Jews is limited to Anatoly Shcharansky.

Ms. Horwitz is a business and consumer writer at the Washington Post. Mr. Mishkin is a trial lawyer with the Washington firm of Melrod, Redman & Gartlan.

16A / THE DETROIT NEWS / Thursday, Oct. 24, 1985 • •

Our Opinions

Opening in the Middle East

There is a slim chance to move now toward peace in the Middle East and it should be grasped. King Hussein of Jordan should accept Israeli Prime Minister Shimon Peres' offer to talk, in Jerusalem or in Amman or anywhere else. Peres, in turn, should be prepared to accept Hussein's suggestion that the Soviet Union be included in peace talks, so long as diplomatic relations between the Soviets and Israelis are first restored. And the Senate is right to encourage the process by making "meaningful" peace talks a condition of the \$1.9 billion arms deal negotiated between the Reagan Administration and the Jordanians.

We've always maintained there are, or at least there ought to be, useful limits to the Senate's "advise and consent" powers in matters of foreign policy. As concerns the Middle East, however, one administration after another, not least the present one, has fallen for the mirage of Arab moderation, which supposedly can be enhanced and encouraged by an "even-handed" approach which amounts to a quid (arms) without a pro (recognition of Israel and peace.) The Senate has usually been more sensible in this area. This is a case in point.

If Hussein faces a security threat, \$2 billion of arms won't protect him. The threat he faces comes from Arab enemies of the Hashemite family of which Hussein dearly desires not to be the last representative. If Hussein faces a Syrian threat, only a firm American, and eventually an Israeli, alliance can deter trouble.

Hussein had attempted to get the Palestinian Liberation Organization included, by some feeble subterfuges, in negotiations between himself and the Israelis. If he did this because he honestly believed there had at long last developed a moderate faction within the PLO, led by Yasser Arafat, he was sorely disabused by the pirates who seized the Achille Lauro and murdered Leon Klinghoffer in his wheel chair. One of the captured pirates is reported to have confessed to his Italian jailers that Abu Abbas, one of Arafat's closest lieutenants, masterminded the hijacking.

Israel has objected to Soviet participation in peace conferences because the two nations

have not had diplomatic relations since the Soviets broke them during the Six Day War in 1967. But if relations are restored, as Israel insists they must be, Soviet participation in a peace conference may make it easier for Hussein to come to the table.

There is a risk here, and it is a significant one. The Soviets will probably try to act as spoilers. If they do, perhaps Hussein will learn that he must do without them, just as he has (we hope) finally learn that he must do without the PLO. And if the Soviets try to get him into their corner, our diplomats should take a leaf from the Senators and understand that their job is to make it perfectly clear to Hussein that doing so will cost him dearly. Soviet mischief could be minimized — we hope — by including the other Security Council members in an umbrella group that would do little more than provide a forum for direct talks between Israel and Jordan.

We are not especially sanguine about the latest initiative for Mideast peace, but then there is no need to be. Let's be realistic even as we demonstrate that we are open to all sensible ideas. And let's remember that our openness will be taken all the more seriously as it is backed by a credible threat to come down hard on those who cross or disappoint us.

It should also be impressed on minds in Washington that this latest demarche follows on the heels of tough Israeli reprisals against the PLO and U.S. reaction to the Achille Lauro incident. For years we have been told that the way to foster the "peace process" in the Middle East was to appease the radicals. We are now finding that exactly the opposite is the case. There will be no peace as long as the democracies give hope to the radicals, whose interest is not in peace but in power for themselves. And moderate Arabs will not come forward if we are constantly threatening to leave them dangling in the breeze while we pursue fantasies of a "moderate" PLO. The time is now ripe for progress in the Middle East because of firmness, not weakness. A true peace process is one that creates true conditions for peace, not an artificial diplomatic charade that can be torpedoed by any crazy

Our Opinions

Turning Point

In a show of national resolve and military effectiveness, the Reagan administration forced down an Egyptian plane carrying the four terrorists who hijacked the Achille Lauro late Thursday night. The Palestinian pirates are now manacled in an Italian jail, awaiting the beginning of a trial — whether ultimately held in Italy or removed to the United States — that should command world attention. If all goes well, this could prove a real turning point in the war on terror.

There's a temptation to want to exact a more visceral vengeance for the wanton murder of a 69-year-old, partially paralyzed American, than that which a trial by due process, in a land where there is no capital punishment, provides. But a fair and public trial, where it's



possible, offers the best hope against terror.

Such a trial is the best way to establish, for all time, the source and nature of the terrorist scourge that has gripped the free world over the past decade. It will also serve to emphasize that there is no moral equivalence between the lawless pirates of the Middle East, despite their claims, and the civilized states upon which they have been making war.

We suspect it will be found that terrorism in the Middle East has a great deal less to do with "social dissatisfaction" and "Zionist oppression" than with good old-fashioned thugery. Those whom the media are pleased to call "leaders," such as Yasser Arafat, will be shown to be gangsters.

The Italians, who will have the first crack at prosecuting the pirates, should be trusted. Alone among our European allies, they have proved that they have the wit and the will to combat terrorism. They brought the violence of their Red Brigades to heel in a trial such as the one we now expect, by systematically examining and cross-examining the murderers until a very clear picture had emerged as to the source of the terror. And then they went after the source. Equally important, by showing up the absurd pretensions and hypocrisies of the Red Brigade "revolutionaries," they dried up sympathy for the terrorists.

We reserve some skepticism that the Italians will prosecute the case to the fullest. They have the closest relations with the Palestine

Liberation Organization (PLO) of any NATO member. Indeed, Mr. Arafat has expended much effort courting them, and they have returned the compliment. Until after it became widely known that Leon Klinghoffer had been murdered, Italian Prime Minister Bettino Craxi and Foreign Minister Giulio Andreotti insisted that Mr. Arafat had "materially contributed to the freeing of the hostages unharmed."

But now that the Italians must reckon with the deeds, not the sweet words, of the PLO, we are certain that the scales will fall from their eyes, and they will recognize the nature of the beast. If prosecution is vigilant, the self-deception of all nations — including some parts of our own administration — will be shattered. The United States should press its claim for extradition, but it should be viewed primarily as a trump card in case the Italians falter.

PLO "chairman" Yasser Arafat denied complicity throughout the latest incident. When things went wrong, he tried to gain extra points in world opinion by offering to negotiate the end of the ordeal, and conduct his own trial of the pirates. Former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger noted that it is hard to believe that Arafat had the power to stop the action, but not to start it.

Meanwhile, PLO spokesmen have castigated the United States for intercepting the plane, and have warned that future hijackings are now more likely to end in the death of innocent passengers because terrorists will not trust those who offer safe passage. That must be read as a vow of continued warfare, by the PLO and Chairman Arafat, against the civilized world. The terrorists will try not to repeat the obvious mistakes that made them so vulnerable this time around.

But we shouldn't despair. Success feeds on itself. Greece and Tunisia, both of whom have recently paid harsh penalties for harboring terrorists, this time declined to offer safe harbor to murderers. Just and proportionate retaliation does work. Deterrence is possible. And we need pay little heed to the ridiculous quibbles that the U.S. interception of the escape plane amounted to a case of piracy itself. Thanks in large part to terrorism, international law has become a farce anyway.

We will never know to what extent President Hosni Mubarak secretly cooperated with the United States while appearing to placate his Arab neighbors by setting the terrorists free. It is wise to resist speculation, and proceed with our relations as allies. Insofar as there is a peace process in the Middle East, Egypt must be ranked as one of its brighter hopes.

The swift strike that intercepted that plane may just signal a turning point from the acquiescence of the West in our own decapitation, to regaining the habit of fighting back, and fighting to win at that. We were fortunate this time, in that the terrorists made serious tactical mistakes. More difficult operations may be necessary in the future before we finally bring a halt to the assault on civilization. But we can take heart from this success.

Mubarak: What got him so worked up?

By WILLIAM F. BUCKLEY JR.
Universal Press Syndicate

THE PUBLIC tantrum of Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak has got to be the kind of thing for which one prepares by spending an entire hour in makeup, where they supply tears of rage, drawn eyes, the throbbing veins in the forehead.

After all, Mubarak is a pretty cool cat, and he can be assumed to know how the American government felt after the hijacking of the Achille Lauro, and how the American people felt when they learned that a cripple in a wheelchair had been shot and tossed overboard.

What Mubarak promised the hijackers was safe passage out of Egypt. In a purely technical sense, he lived up to exactly what he promised. The hijackers were indeed shipped out of Egypt, and they left the country without molestation.

WHAT THEN happened was not Egypt's responsibility. If the United States is guilty of piracy as Mubarak charges, then the United States has to answer to a court of world opinion, given that it no longer accepts the jurisdiction of the World Court in matters involving political questions.

The court of world opinion is not likely to consider it an act of piracy to apprehend an airplane carrying fugitives from justice. Piracy is more generally understood as apprehending a vehicle with innocent people in it for the purpose of kidnapping or killing them.

Mubarak senses this, and he is himself intimately aware of the consequences of terrorism. Indeed, if it were not for the most dramatic act of terrorism in 1981, he wouldn't be president of Egypt. Anwar Sadat was sitting a few feet from him when Sadat was shot by fanatic Muslims, aggrieved by

that great statesman's noble act of reconciliation with Israel. Therein lies the explanation for Mubarak's synthetic wrath.

Here is another way to seek perspective in the matter. Suppose that the four hijackers had been members of the IRA, the Irish terrorist association. Suppose the identical scenario: A large Italian cruising ship is seized, a passenger is killed, the IRA terrorists put in at Port Said and negotiate for safe passage, which is tendered, and the Egyptian airliner is brought down in Sicily. Would Mubarak and the Egyptian people have felt the same sense of outrage? No.

THE PROBLEM is a deep one, and every time one breathes a little hope, as we did a few weeks ago when it looked as though Jordan's King Hussein would enter into active negotiations with Israel, the seething resentments of the region are ventilated. The protest is over the capture of four Palestinian terrorists — because the sympathy of most of the Arab world is, let's face it, with them, rather than with law and order.

It's precisely the knowledge of where the sympathy lies that moved the Italian government, knowing full

The protest is over the capture of four Palestinian terrorists — because the sympathy of most of the Arab world is, let's face it, with them, rather than with law and order.

well that the United States would be enraged by the act, to release Mohammed Abbas of the Palestine Liberation Front. The probabilities are high that our old friend Abbas, the seasoned terrorist, masterminded the whole maneuver aboard the Achille Lauro. But Italian Prime Minister Bettino Craxi, pleading the insufficiency of prosecu-



"With friends like these, who needs enemies?"

torial documentation, elected to let him slip away to Yugoslavia.

His was a political gesture, pure and simple. The Arab world understood that Italy has to prosecute four terrorists who hijacked an Italian liner and

the action of the Italian government, but we do not get aroused that easily.

PROTESTS within Egypt continue. My favorite is that of the Egyptian pharmacists, who pledged not again to use any American drugs until Egypt is pacified by a presidential apology, which of course is not forthcoming. All of this leaves us worrying about Egyptian health and hygiene when deprived of U.S. aspirin and deodorants.

Boys will be boys, but Mubarak has perhaps wrenched a little too firmly the tail of our tiger when he reported that he had not even bothered to open the letter sent to him by the president of the United States.

Who knows what was in that letter? Perhaps our intelligence people in Cairo — the same ones who discovered that Mubarak was lying to us all when he said the hijackers had already left Egypt when in fact they were still there — might whisper the word around Cairo that Reagan's letter had in it a P.S., to wit: "Dear Mr. Mubarak: Unless I receive an acknowledgment of my letter above by Oct. 17, all economic aid by the United States to your country (\$17 billion during the past 10 years) will be suspended."

That would get that letter opened, is my guess.